

12:05:37 From Stacie Kyhn : I have read it.

12:05:41 From Chris Sabino : I've read it.

12:05:41 From Richard Leedy : I have read it

12:05:42 From Nancy Rivers : Have read it

12:05:43 From Paula Wilhite to All panelists : Yes

12:05:46 From Beth Kelch : Yes

12:05:47 From Barbra Steinhurst : Yes, have read it.

12:05:51 From Joseph Luc to All panelists : I have read it.

12:05:52 From Keith Nabb : Yes, read the statement.

12:05:54 From Lisa Feinman : yes

12:05:54 From Paula Wilhite to All panelists : Hi everyone!

12:05:55 From Chris Ward : Have read it

12:05:56 From Jim Ham : Yes. Read it. Current version looks good.

12:05:58 From Marta Szpak : yes

12:06:07 From Anne Dudley : Read it

12:07:03 From Kathryn Van Wagoner : [https://drive.google.com/file/d/1bv3zWIhCs\\_JHAj4t4pAmvdv\\_0ZE-cy8G/view?usp=sharing](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1bv3zWIhCs_JHAj4t4pAmvdv_0ZE-cy8G/view?usp=sharing)

12:10:23 From Lisa Feinman : Has anyone reached out to the Mathematics Committee of NOSS?

12:11:14 From Kathryn Kozak : I agree about reaching out to AMTE. I can introduce you to Michael Steele if you want me to.

12:11:54 From Lisa Feinman : Use the document as a springboard I think

12:11:55 From Kathryn Kozak : I can also introduce you to NOSS's president.

12:11:56 From Jim Ham : I like the collaboration idea. After this statement is approved in the fall (hopefully), we should consider a collaboration with AMTE and maybe even NCSM.

12:12:25 From Richard Leedy : I agree with using the document as a springboard

12:13:19 From Lisa Feinman : Annette is the manager - the Treasurer is also an AMATYC member (Carol Mueller)

12:13:30 From Nancy Rivers : Is it just me? I can't get the Google doc to open.

12:13:45 From Lisa Feinman : Nice!

12:14:46 From Lisa Feinman : Nancy, I can open it.

12:15:41 From Sophia Georgiakaki : can someone please send the document link again?

12:15:47 From Nancy Rivers : I had to download and then Open it - Not my usual Google doc experience (It is in word, not google doc

12:15:53 From Lisa Feinman : Could we just say "through programs" and omit 'graduate'?

12:16:14 From Pat Riley - Webinar Coord. :  
[https://drive.google.com/file/d/1bv3zWIhCs\\_JHAj4t4pAmvdv\\_0ZE-cy8G/view?usp=sharing](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1bv3zWIhCs_JHAj4t4pAmvdv_0ZE-cy8G/view?usp=sharing)

12:16:21 From Sophia Georgiakaki : Thank you Pat!

12:16:24 From Chris Ward : Is section two suppose to be directed only to teaching in higher ed where section 1 sounds like it directed to k-12 p

12:16:47 From Richard Leedy : The line numbers are in the document she sent earlier

12:17:16 From Beverly Vance to All panelists : Pat sent it out to registered members this morning.

12:17:43 From Stacie Kyhn : If you take out "graduate" in line 24 should do it.

12:17:56 From Lisa Feinman : line 20 as well

12:18:03 From Lisa Feinman : and 26

12:18:28 From Stacie Kyhn : Rather than teachers, how about educators. "Teachers" implies K-12 to me.

12:18:44 From Chris Ward : That is why I asked if Section 2 refered more to Higher Ed

12:19:03 From TAMIE DICKSON to All panelists : Or "instructors" instead of "teachers"?

12:19:46 From Nancy Rivers : I take the statement in lines 7 and 8 to say that this entire document is focused on instructors at the first two years of college level.

12:20:52 From Lisa Feinman : This is a position, not policy

12:21:10 From Lisa Feinman : To provide justification for the need for PD for educators

12:21:21 From Paula Wilhite to All panelists : Lisa, I agree.

12:23:15 From Chris Ward : Rereading it I see Kathryn's vision. Section 1 refers to us teaching Section 2 refers to those (mainly 4 yrs) in how they "train" educators to fill Section 1

12:23:38 From Chris Ward : Talking other Kathryn :)

12:23:58 From Nancy Rivers : Inline 20 could we replace "teachers to teach" with "faculty"?

12:25:18 From Stacie Kyhn : I like leaving graduate programs in line 20. I think we can leave out graduate later.

12:25:32 From Lisa Feinman : ok

12:25:41 From Lisa Feinman : Kate, I like that

12:26:45 From Nancy Rivers : In North Carolina teachers of developmental math only need a bachelor's degree

12:26:57 From Chris Sabino : For our foundational studies, only a Bachelors is required at my college. But those courses are not technically designated as developmental.

12:28:18 From Nancy Rivers : I like "degree programs"

12:28:24 From Paula Wilhite to All panelists : I think the reason that graduate is listed is because the previous position statement that we are revising designated graduate. These are all good points!

12:28:24 From Chris Sabino : But wouldn't they be caught by 1 and 3?

12:28:43 From Joseph Luc to All panelists : Line 20 makes it seem that we are only targeting students who are majoring in math education.

12:30:40 From Nancy Rivers : Line 20 "2. Institutions and/or departments preparing faculty to teach through degree programs in mathematics, ..."

12:30:55 From Chris Ward to All panelists : Chris S. (I think ) Section 1 refers to you as a the teacher where Section 2 refers to who taught you to be a teacher

12:31:08 From Joseph Luc to All panelists : I agree with Nancy.

12:31:12 From Chris Ward : Chris S. (I think ) Section 1 refers to you as a the teacher where Section 2 refers to who taught you to be a teacher

12:32:06 From Nancy Rivers : and then in lines 24 and 26 remove "graduate"

12:33:14 From Stacie Kyhn : I agree with Nancy's recommendation on lines 24 and 26. "graduate" is not needed there.

12:33:50 From Chris Sabino : Chris W. I agree. Section 2 opens the door for more programs to think about teaching to teach in the midst of teaching to be mathematicians. 1 and 3 allow for on boarding and initial training for new faculty, regardless of their past experiences. Even if grad. students go through a program, that doesn't mean they wouldn't benefit from more work on SotL or ongoing PD.

12:34:12 From Chris Ward : Does the order seem right .. Start with Section 2 then do Section 1?

12:35:04 From Lisa Feinman : I don't think it matters?

12:36:12 From Paula Wilhite to All panelists : Nancy, I agree.

12:36:36 From Lisa Feinman : Nancy that makes sense

12:36:47 From Jing Xie to All panelists : I agree the idea that graduate students need to get trained to teach developmental students regardless if they have experience already or not.

12:37:59 From Chris Sabino : That would have been my one comment. Thanks!

12:38:10 From Anne Dudley : In item #3, I don't feel partner institutions is clear. Who are the partner institutions?

12:38:56 From Paula Wilhite to All panelists : I am not sure how to turn on my audio.

12:39:51 From Nancy Rivers to All panelists : Are we saying that those institutions employing faculty to teach developmental mathematics should partner with the institutions that provide coursework in the pedagogy?

12:41:22 From Keith Nabb to All panelists : Can I read something from AMTE?

12:44:06 From Chris Sabino : Is the main goal of #3 the collaboration aspect or the prof. growth opportunities aspect?

12:44:19 From Keith Nabb to All panelists : ACTION Step 4 articulates, "Faculty in programs preparing teachers of mathematics must build collaborations with faculty in other programs preparing teachers of mathematics."

12:44:53 From Keith Nabb to All panelists : ACTION 7 "AMTE must work to engage other organizations with related missions in dialogue around how the standards can inform the preparation of teachers of mathematics."

12:45:35 From Nancy Rivers to All panelists : "3. All institutions employing faculty to teach developmental mathematics should collaborate with institutions that provide coursework on relevant pedagogy as well as AMATYC and other related professional organizations to promote and..."

12:47:04 From Chris Ward : Thumbs Up

12:47:15 From Keith Nabb to All panelists : Yep

12:47:16 From Paula Wilhite : I like Nancy's suggestion.  
12:48:04 From Nancy Rivers to All panelists : I agree with Anne.  
12:49:01 From Lisa Feinman : I'm ok with those  
12:49:02 From Anne Dudley to All panelists : Sounds good to me.  
12:51:10 From Mary Emma Dunn-Richardson to All panelists : I'm OK with it.  
12:51:29 From Mary Emma Dunn-Richardson : OK!  
12:51:48 From william weppner : Here in TN we don't refer to this math anymore as Developmental, rather co-requisite math. All the topics are presented via a publisher's package. We not reaching anymore ... but, course managing! ~Bill Weppner  
12:53:58 From Lisa Feinman : I wouldn't say developmental students  
12:54:06 From william weppner : Correction: "teaching" not "reaching" Thanks  
12:54:38 From Lisa Feinman : yes, what Chris just said!  
12:54:57 From Richard Leedy : I agree with Chris  
12:55:38 From Nancy Rivers to All panelists : OK - here's a can of worms... Should we add in the need for PD of faculty teaching developmental mathematics in a co-requisite setting? That is, a statement of teaching what has been historically referred to as developmental mathematics as stand-alone classes or in the co-requisite format.  
12:55:59 From Nancy Rivers to All panelists : Like the revised title  
12:56:10 From Chris Ward : I like that  
12:57:25 From Jing Xie to All panelists : correct  
12:58:46 From Nancy Rivers to All panelists : Line 3 "Teaching what has been traditionally referred to developmental mathematics, whether as a stand alone course or in the developmental format, requires both mathematical knowledge..."  
12:58:57 From Anne Dudley to All panelists : I have to run, I have another Zoom meeting. Thanks! Nice Job!  
12:59:26 From Richard Leedy : Does saying faculty who teach developmental mathematics imply they only teach developmental math? Or should we say teach developmental math courses?  
12:59:51 From Richard Leedy : The heading  
12:59:54 From Jim Ham : Chris' proposed new title: "Professional Development for Faculty Teaching Developmental Mathematics"  
13:00:38 From Lisa Feinman : I don't think the word courses is needed.  
13:00:43 From Nancy Rivers to All panelists : Line 3 "Teaching what has been traditionally referred to as developmental mathematics, whether as a stand alone course or in the co-requisite format, requires both mathematical knowledge ..."  
13:00:46 From Richard Leedy : Just include the word courses  
13:00:47 From william weppner : Bravo everyone!  
13:01:08 From Jim Ham : Thanks Kathryn & Pat and everyone.  
13:01:12 From Lisa Feinman : Thank you  
13:01:12 From Chris Sabino : Thanks!  
13:01:17 From Paula Wilhite : Kathryn and Pat: Thank you! Awesome job!  
13:01:20 From Keith Nabb to All panelists : Nice work!  
13:01:21 From Richard Leedy : Thank you too  
13:01:40 From Nancy Rivers to All panelists : Thank you! Great work!!!  
13:01:57 From Jackie Murawska to All panelists : Thank you!  
13:02:06 From Jackie Murawska : Thank you!  
13:02:38 From Kathryn Kozak to All panelists : Great job Kathryn and Pat!  
13:02:48 From Chris Ward : Thanks all  
13:03:07 From Mary Emma Dunn-Richardson : Thanks to all!